

REMARKS

Claims 1-3 and 10-24 are all the claims pending in the application.

I. Response to Rejection under 35 U.S.C. § 112, Second Paragraph

Claim 2 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph, as allegedly being indefinite. Applicants respectfully traverse the rejection for the following reasons.

Applicants respectfully submit that “a neutralization degree” recited in claim 2 does not have a unit. Specifically, the term “neutralization degree of a potassium ionomer,” as used in the present application, refers to a percent of the number of potassium-neutralized carboxylic acid units over the total number of un-neutralized and potassium-neutralized carboxylic acid units in one potassium ionomer, as expressed in the following formula:

$$\text{a neutralization degree} = \frac{\text{potassium-neutralized carboxylic acid units}}{\text{un-neutralized carboxylic acid units} + \text{potassium-neutralized carboxylic acid units}}$$

Therefore, a “neutralization degree” is without unit.

In view of the foregoing, the Examiner is respectfully requested to reconsider and withdraw the § 112 rejection.

II. Response to Rejection under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a)

Claims 1-3 and 10-24 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as allegedly being unpatentable over US 2006/0189758 (“Nakano”).

Nakano was filed February 7, 2003, and published August 24, 2006. The August 24, 2006 publication date of Nakano is subsequent to the February 4, 2004 effective filing date of the present application, while the February 7, 2003 filing date of Nakano is prior to the February 4, 2004 filing date of the present application. Therefore, Nakano may be available as prior art under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) against the present claims.

Applicants state hereby that the present invention and Nakano were commonly owned by, or under an obligation of assignment to, the same organization, i.e., Du Pont Mitsui-Polychemicals Co., Ltd, at the time the present invention was made, thereby removing Nakano as prior art under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) in this § 103 rejection against the present claims. Accordingly, the Examiner is respectfully requested to reconsider and withdraw the rejection.

III. Conclusion

From the foregoing, further and favorable action in the form of a Notice of Allowance is believed to be next in order and such action is earnestly solicited. If there are any questions concerning this paper or the application in general, the Examiner is invited to telephone the undersigned at (202) 452-7932 at his earliest convenience.

Respectfully submitted,

BUCHANAN INGERSOLL & ROONEY PC

Date: August 25, 2008

By: _____



Fang Liu, Ph.D.
Registration No. 51283